

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

EUGENIA WHITE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 1:07cv696
)	
FAIRFAX COUNTY GOVERNMENT,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION

THIS MATTER came before the Court, without the need for oral argument, on plaintiff's Motions to Reconsider, for Contempt, and for Continuance (## 106, 110, and 112).

UPON REVIEW of plaintiff's Motions and Memoranda in Support,¹ as well as defendant's Briefs in Opposition, the Court makes the following findings.

First, with respect to plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider, the Court finds no evidence that plaintiff amended her original EEOC Charge of Discrimination No. 100-2005-02108, filed October 5, 2005.² That Charge alleged discrimination took place between

¹ The Court treats plaintiff's Brief in Response to Defendant's Opposition of Motion to Compel (# 109) as part of plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider and has considered it accordingly.

² Plaintiff's subsequent EEOC Charges, filed on March 26, 2007 and April 8, 2008, in which plaintiff alleged discrimination on a broader temporal scope, do not constitute amendments to her original Charge. Plaintiff has not received a Right to Sue Letter based on those latter Charges. In any event, only the

November 18, 2004 and June 30, 2005. Therefore, the Court's discovery limitations as to that time period and job announcements for which plaintiff applied in that time period are appropriate.

Second, plaintiff's original EEOC Charge does not include allegations of hostile work environment. Nor does her original Charge provide a basis for extending the time period for filing complaints of discrimination.

Finally, as to the remainder of plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider, the Court finds no basis upon which to alter its previous Orders regarding any additional discovery to be produced by defendant. Accordingly, plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider is DENIED.

With respect to plaintiff's Motion for Contempt, it appears that defendant properly complied with this Court's Order of June 27, 2008 by mailing its supplemental responses on July 3, 2008. The Court finds no evidence to the contrary. Accordingly, plaintiff's Motion for Contempt is DENIED.

With respect to plaintiff's Motion for Continuance, the Court notes that plaintiff has already received several extensions of discovery deadlines, allowing her to conduct discovery almost three months after the original discovery cutoff of May 9, 2008. Discovery is now at an end. Plaintiff has had

original Charge forms the basis of the instant suit.

ample time to develop her case, and the Court finds no good cause for further extensions of any deadlines, including the trial date. Accordingly, plaintiff's Motion for Continuance is DENIED.

An appropriate Order shall issue.

ENTERED this 26th day of August, 2008.

/s/

THERESA CARROLL BUCHANAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Alexandria, Virginia